## 

1 2	SCOTT G. LAWSON (SBN 174671) BRIAN S. SUNG (SBN 244155) GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP	
3	153 Townsend Street, 8th Fl. San Francisco, CA 94107	
	Telephone: (415) 655-1300	
4	Facsimile: (415) 707-2010 Attorneys for Defendant Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.	
5	M. VAN SMITH (SBN 32007)	
6	1696 Mendenhall Drive San Jose, California 95130	
$^{7}$	Tel: (408) 364-1062 Email: mvsmith@sbcglobal.net	
8	Attorney for Plaintiff Ernest Steven Rodriguez	
9		
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – SAN JOSE DIVISION	
12	ERNEST STEVEN RODRIGUEZ,	Case No. CV 10-05659 JF
13	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING SECOND
14	VS.	CLAIM FOR RELIEF ALLEGED IN THE COMPLAINT
15	WAL-MART STORES, INC.	
16	Defendant.	Complaint Filed: December 13, 2010 Judge: Hon. Jeremy Fogel
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
		Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Rega

Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Regarding Second Claim for Relief Case No.: CV 10-05659-JF

## Case 5:10-cv-05659-JF Document 21 Filed 06/13/11 Page 2 of 3

1 Defendant Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. ("Wal-Mart") and plaintiff Ernest Steven Rodriguez, by and 2 through their respective counsel, stipulate and agree as follows: 3 WHEREAS, plaintiff filed its complaint against Wal-Mart on December 13, 2010; 4 WHEREAS, among the claims alleged by plaintiff in his complaint is the Second Claim for 5 Relief (entitled "Action for Restitution Under Unfair Business Practices Act"), in which plaintiff purports to allege claims under California Business & Professions Code section 17200 representatively on behalf of other Wal-Mart employees who, like plaintiff, hold or held the position 8 of Asset Protection Coordinator; 9 WHEREAS, Wal-Mart contends that the Second Claim for Relief is improper under California 10 law, and informed plaintiff that it intended to file a motion to dismiss the claim; and 11 WHEREAS, following a meet-and-confer process between plaintiff and Wal-Mart, and to 12 avoid unnecessary motion practice, plaintiff has agreed that he will not pursue his Second Claim for 13 Relief in this action, 14 IT IS THEREFORE HEREBY STIPULATED, by and between plaintiff and Wal-Mart, 15 through their respective undersigned counsel, that plaintiff will not pursue in this action his Second 16 Claim for Relief and that the Second Claim for Relief shall henceforth be considered as dismissed and 17 not a claim upon which relief may be granted in this case... 18 In accordance with General Order 45 of the United States District Court for the Northern 19 District of California, I attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from 20 the undersigned counsel. 21 22 DATED: June 8, 2011 GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP 23 By s/ Scott G. Lawson Scott G. Lawson 24 GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP lawsons@gtlaw.com 25 Attorneys for Defendant Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. 26 27 28 -1-Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Regarding Second Claim of the

Complaint Case No.: CV 10-05659-JF

## By s/M. Van Smith M. Van Smith (SBN 32007) 1696 Mendenhall Drive DATED: June 8, 2011 2 San Jose, California 95130 Tel: (408) 364-1062 Email: mvsmith@sbcglobal.net Attorney for Plaintiff Ernest Steven Rodriguez 6 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS HEREBY SO ORDERED. 8 June 9, 2011 DATED: rable Jeremy Fogel UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 **17** 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 **28** -2-

Case 5:10-cv-05659-JF Document 21 Filed 06/13/11 Page 3 of 3

Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Regarding Second Claim for Relief Case No.: CV 10-05659-JF